

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MARY ELIZABETH PITRELLO,

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00835-APG-EJY

Petitioner

Order

V.

G. NAJERA, et al.,

## Respondents

On July 29, 2022, I granted habeas corpus petitioner Mary Elizabeth Pitrello's request to appoint counsel and appointed the Federal Public Defender to represent Pitrello (ECF No. 6). On August 31, 2022, Alicia R. Intriago of the Federal Public Defender's Office (FPD) appeared on behalf of petitioner (ECF No. 10).

I THEREFORE ORDER that counsel for petitioner meet with petitioner as soon as reasonably possible to: (a) review the procedures applicable in cases under 28 U.S.C. § 2254; (b) discuss and explore with petitioner, as fully as possible, the potential grounds for habeas corpus relief in petitioner's case; and (c) advise petitioner that all possible grounds for habeas corpus relief must be raised at this time and that the failure to do so will likely result in the omitted grounds being barred from future review under the rules regarding abuse of writ.

18 I FURTHER ORDER that counsel for petitioner file an amended petition for writ of  
19 habeas corpus within **90 days**, which includes all known grounds for relief (both exhausted and  
20 unexhausted).

I FURTHER ORDER that respondents file a response to the petition within **90 days** of service of the petition. Petitioner will then have **45 days** from service of the answer, motion to


1 dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition. Any other motions will be subject to the  
2 normal briefing schedule under the local rules.

3 Any response to the petition must comport with Habeas Rule 5. Additionally:

- 4 1. Any procedural defenses raised by respondents in this case must be raised together in a  
5 single, consolidated motion to dismiss. In other words, the court does not wish to address  
6 any procedural defenses raised herein either in seriatum fashion in multiple successive  
7 motions to dismiss or embedded in the answer. Procedural defenses omitted from the  
8 motion to dismiss will be subject to potential waiver.
- 9 2. Respondents must not file a response in this case that consolidates their procedural  
10 defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except under 28 U.S.C.  
11 § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If respondents do seek  
12 dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they must do so within the single  
13 motion to dismiss, not in the answer, and (b) they must specifically direct their argument  
14 to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d  
15 614, 623–24 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural defenses, including exhaustion,  
16 should be included with the merits in an answer. All procedural defenses, including  
17 exhaustion, must instead be raised by motion to dismiss.
- 18 3. In any answer filed on the merits, respondents must specifically cite to and address the  
19 applicable state-court written decision and state-court record materials, if any, regarding  
20 each claim within the response as to that claim; and
- 21 4. Respondents must file a set of state court exhibits relevant to the response filed to the  
22 petition. Those exhibits must be filed chronologically and be accompanied by a separate  
23 index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are

1 filed must be identified by the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment. The  
2 purpose of this provision is to allow the court and any reviewing court thereafter to  
3 quickly determine from the face of the electronic docket sheet which numbered exhibits  
4 are filed in which attachments. Respondents must send a hard copy of all pleadings and  
5 indices of exhibits **ONLY** filed for this case to the Clerk of Court, 400 S. Virginia St.,  
6 Reno, NV, 89501, directed to the attention of "Staff Attorney" on the outside of the  
7 mailing address label.

8  
9  
10  
11 Dated: September 6, 2022

12   
13 U.S. District Judge Andrew P. Gordon